

VOLUME 7.

NUMBER 8.

PRICE 1/-

Christian Order

Summary of Contents for August 1966

CHURCH AND SOCIETY

Edward Duff, S.J.

LIBERALISM AND PROPERTY

John Francis Maxwell

THE GOLDEN STATE

Maureen Nyhan

THE LIGHT FROM CUBA

Paul Crane, S.J.

THE SEAMEN'S STRIKE

J. M. Jackson

SEARCH FOR CERTAINTY

E. L. Way

Contents

Page

449 MR. CALLAGHAN AND THE VOLUN-
TARY PRINCIPLE
The Editor

451 CHURCH AND SOCIETY
Edward Duff, SJ

461 CURRENT COMMENT—LIBERALISM
AND PROPERTY
John Francis Maxwell

476 MONTHLY REPORT—THE GOLDEN
STATE
Maureen Nyhan

484 INDUSTRIAL ANGLE — SEAMEN'S
STRIKE
J. M. Jackson

493 ANY QUESTIONS ?
William Lawson, SJ

498 PADRES OF SAN MIGUELITO: X
Michael Campbell-Johnston, SJ

507 BOOK REVIEWS
Paul Crane, SJ

IF YOU CHANGE YOUR ADDRESS:
If you are planning to change your address please let us know at least two or three weeks ahead because subscription lists are made up in advance. Send us both new and old addresses.

CHRISTIAN ORDER is a monthly magazine devoted to the promulgation of Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs. It is published for Father Paul Crane, S.J., 65 Belgrave Road, London SW1, by C. J. Fallon (London) Ltd., 1 Furnival St., London EC4 and 31 King St., Belfast 1, and printed in the Republic of Ireland by The Record Press Ltd., Emmet Road, Bray.

Annual subscription: one year, fifteen shillings; in the U.S.A. and Canada three dollars; in Australia twenty-one shillings; postage paid.

Those who previously bought Christian Order each month at their church door or elsewhere are advised that the magazine is obtainable by subscription only. The rate is 15/- per annum. Send your subscription please to:

C. J. Fallon Ltd.,
43 Parkgate Street,
Dublin 8, Ireland.

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 7

AUGUST, 1966

NUMBER 8

Mr. Callaghan and the Voluntary Principle

THE EDITOR

AN editorial last month criticised the Chancellor's Budget as likely to result in an even more wasteful deployment of this country's manpower than is at present the case. Far from forcing on employers a more economic use of Britain's labour power, Mr. Callaghan's selective employment tax will probably have the reverse effect. On this ground, it was described, with justice, as a footling performance.

It is difficult to forgive such stupidity, especially at a time like the present when the country's economy is so close to a knife-edge. Nevertheless, one should make an effort to do so. What cannot be forgiven, however, is the vicious attack launched by the Chancellor in his Budget on the voluntary principle as such. I refer to those of its clauses which apply the selective employment tax in all its severity to voluntary bodies and charitable associations. This is unforgiveable. It stands in flagrant contradiction to the right of the individual citizen to associate with others for the pursuit of any of an almost countless number of legitimate objectives.

This right of association comes from God, not Mr.

Callaghan. Presumably, the Chancellor of the Exchequer is unaware of this. Otherwise, I doubt whether he would have the temerity to strike at one of the fundamental rights of his fellow-men as viciously as he has done in his Budget. One concludes that he is ignorant of the issues involved. Our prayer for him must rest on the ground that, in this matter of right, he simply does not know what he is doing. It is a pathetic condition for any man to be in, let alone a high officer of State. It should give no cause for surprise, however, in a secularist world. The chances of a Christian viewpoint making any immediate impact on that world are dim. Nevertheless, the attempt must always be made. What follows is an endeavour, in the brief space at my disposal, to give moral substance to the voluntary principle in public life.

The right of association comes from God with our nature, which is meant for God's service through the fulfilment of ourselves. This can only be through the responsible exercise of our human powers. It is as an expression of such exercise that voluntary bodies have their right to exist and government the duty, under God, of enabling them to do so. The gist of the argument is as follows—government is for human nature, human nature is for God's service through the fulfilment of itself, fulfilment is through the responsible exercise of human powers; it is government's duty, therefore, to foster man's right of voluntary association as flowing from his basic right to the responsible exercise of his human powers. A government which respects this right is true to itself. One that does not, denies, as Leo XIII said seventy-five years ago, the very reason of its existence. It is this that Mr. Callaghan has done in the case of the Government of which he is a member. He has used its power to strike a crippling blow at the very principle which the power of government is designed to protect. By so doing, he has deprived the present Government of its main claim to further existence. Governments exist to support human dignity, not to deface it. This, apparently, is what Mr. Callaghan and his colleagues are unable to see.

This important article deals with the World Council of Churches' Conference which took place in July in Geneva. It has such a wealth of background information, such a wide scope that, though late from the mere point of journalistic topicality, it simply had to be published.

Church and Society

**THE CONFERENCE OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF
CHURCHES**

EDWARD DUFF, S.J.

IT is a mistake, but a widespread one, to suppose that the ecumenical movement involves merely the search for ecclesiastical unity and that the exclusive aim of the World Council of Churches is to serve as an instrument furthering that goal. Such an error distorts both history and stated purposes. For, in addition to the quest for the greater collaboration in missionary endeavour, the original impetus and deepest root of the ecumenical enterprise in twentieth-century Protestantism, the determination in many lands and many churches to make religion relevant to social needs, and more effective in constructing a more humane civilisation, was a capital factor in drawing Christians out of their denominational isolation. Such a determination was a primary factor in the formation of the World Council of Churches. And it is to express that continuing concern that the World Council is sponsoring a World Conference on Church and Society in Geneva on July 12th-26th with a 100 participants from all quarters of the globe. The main theme of the Conference is "Christians in the Technical and Social Revolutions of our Times".

A Common Voice

It may be fruitful to recall that the World Council of Churches as formally constituted at Amsterdam on August

23, 1948, was a confluence of two existing movements: the World Conference on Faith and Order and the Universal Christian Council on Life and Work. Since Amsterdam, the Faith and Order interests, those concerned with doctrine and ecclesiastical policy, have met at Lund, Sweden in 1952 and at Montreal in 1963. Yet, apart from sharing the content programme at the World Council's Assemblies at Evanston, U.S.A., in 1954 and at New Delhi in 1951, the concerns that will be explored at the coming Geneva meeting have not been the subject of an extended, special international convocation under World Council auspices. Not that the issues of justice among men and peace in the world has not preoccupied the leadership of the ecumenical community from the beginning. As conceived by the Swedish Archbishop Nathan Soderblom, the project of a council of churches was precisely to provide a common voice on questions of economic order and world peace. A similar argument was put forward by William Temple (Archbishop of Canterbury) in proposing the plan for the World Council of Churches in 1937. Such, too, was the understanding and original basis for co-operation of the Orthodox churches in the ecumenical movement. It is not without significance that the doctoral dissertation of the World Council's Secretary, Dr. V. A. Visser't Hooft is entitled "The Background of the Social Gospel in America". His successor-to-be, Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, has been outstanding in the struggle for racial justice in the United States.

The Responsible Society

From its inception, the World Council of Churches (in addition to extensive activity for the refugees and disaster victims) has had an office fostering the study of the meaning of the Christian faith for social thought and action. Under the direction of the Reverend Paul Abrecht, this Department of Church and Society elaborates a tradition of ecumenical inquiry that dates from the Stockholm Conference of 1925, the Oxford Conference on "Church, Community and State" of 1937 and continued in the discussions at three World Council Assemblies. These last have con-

tributed as a legacy the concept of "the Responsible Society", balancing the competing claims of freedom and order, a clear and unabashed rejection of racism (at the price of the withdrawal of member churches of South Africa), an eloquent espousal of human rights and religious freedom, and a sustained effort to cope with the causes of international conflict in "mutually suspicious and antagonist blocs" of nations. With the increasing representation of the Younger Churches of Asia and Africa, the department has had its attention turned to the problems of rapid social change in a contracting globe and to the requirements and consequences of economic development. The conviction of the interaction of a multitude of elements — technology, population growth, urbanisation, decolonisation, race, secularisation and the reawakening of long dormant, ancient religions—moved the Central Committee of the World Council in 1962 to approve the convening of a representative group of competent laymen and theologians to think together on these crucial issues of contemporary society.

Hope for deepening Understanding

In the serene certainties of the post-Versailles era, the opening sermon of the Stockholm conference proclaimed that the establishment of the Kingdom of Heaven was the purpose of the gathering. The World Council's Central Committee, surveying contemporary confusions and complexities, is less sanguine. In its summons for the Geneva meeting it observed: "It is evident that there is basic disagreement in the churches about the significance of world events and their interpretation. This is partly due to the diversity of culture and history and to the ideological conflicts which divide the world; but it also represents serious differences regarding the meaning of our common faith for social thought and action". It is hoped that the analyses and discussions of the Geneva conference, aided by the insights of participating economists, political leaders, trade unionists, businessmen, and agricultural experts, will deepen the Christian understanding of the world's agonizing problems and clarify the role of the churches in tackling them. The thinking and conclusions of the Conference,

moreover, will have a direct bearing on the scope and social stance of the Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches, and its ultimate authority. This Assembly will be held at Uppsala, Sweden in 1968.

Strenuous and sustained efforts have been made by the Geneva secretariat to bring technical competence and wide and diverse experience to the preparations for the coming Conference on Church and Society. Generalised proclamations of Christ's Lordship over the world and fervent appeals for peace among men and nations are recognised as empty, futile gestures. The maturing experience of the ecumenical enterprise as well as a more sophisticated appreciation of the interconnected and intractable ills of society have inculcated a serious approach to problems, and a modesty of utterance. There is today a wider realisation of the wisdom of Reinhold Niebuhr's observation: "The lack of a clear spiritual witness to the truth of Christ is aggravated by certain modern developments, among them the increasing complexity of moral problems and the increasing dominance of the group or collective over the life of the individual. The complexity of ethical problems makes an evangelical impulse to seek the good of the neighbour subordinate to the complicated questions about which of our neighbours has first claim upon us, or what technical means are best suited to fulfil their need. The Enlightenment was wrong in expecting virtue to flow inevitably from rational enlightenment. But that does not change the fact that religiously inspired good will, without intelligent analysis of the factors in a moral situation and of the proper means to gain desirable ends, is unavailing".

Desire for Universality

To illumine the areas of investigation of the Conference on Church and Society four background volumes have been produced, each a symposium of scholars of different cultural inheritance and denominational allegiance. The issues of the Oxford Conference of 1937 was practically exclusively Western with the menace of totalitarian governments, and the disastrous effects of the Depression, and the imminence of war central. The selection of authors of the study

volumes and of speakers for the programme of the Geneva Conference manifests a resolute will that all points of view will be heard, those of Asia, Africa and Latin America not least. This desire for universality undoubtedly explains the invitation to Roman Catholic experts to contribute to the background volumes and to Cardinal Bea's Secretariat for Unity to nominate eight official observers. It clearly dictated the decision to restrict the number of American participants to 40. The Geneva Conference will offer the Russian Orthodox Church, accepted for membership in the World Council at its last Assembly, an opportunity to express its views on economic and political structures and on international organisation. What it has learned in its long and painful efforts to survive in an aggressively atheist society, what its suggestions on the specific role of the churches in the contemporary world, is awaited with no small interest. The programme lists Metropolitan Nicodim of Leningrad, spokesman for the Moscow Patriarchate on international affairs as commentator on a paper "Recent Developments in Roman Catholic Social Thinking" to be presented by Canon Charles Moeller, Secretary of the Congregation for the Defence of the Faith of the Holy See. Such an ecumenical confrontation might be considered a prolongation of the perspective of the Second Vatican Council's Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, a document which, it is said, was followed with intense interest by the Russian Orthodox observer-delegate at the Council, and which was taken into account in planning the Geneva Conference, one reads, as "together presenting an opportunity to take us a step further in common Christian thinking".

Two Crowded Weeks

Participants at the Geneva Conference can anticipate two crowded weeks of corporate prayer and continuous discussion with addresses and comments scheduled for each evening. As far as possible, each participant has been assigned to one of four sections of his personal preference, each examining a phase of the main theme. These sections will be further subdivided into groups of about 25 to be summarised as

conclusions of the sections; these will be presented at plenary meetings for emendation and editing as a report for the guidance and appropriate action of the member churches of the World Council. To explore the meaning of the main theme three opening addresses will consider these aspects: potentialities of the scientific and technological revolutions, the political and economic dynamics of awakened peoples, the challenge and relevance of theology to the revolution (including two presentations on the related topic of the search for a new ethos for new societies).

To describe the transformations of contemporary world society when history seems telescoped is at once simple and prodigiously complicated: man has largely mastered his environment and is jettisoning notions of transcendent values. For the first time the means and the tools are at hand to supply the basic material needs of all men. At the same time the physical power to annihilate life on earth is also available. The bonds of an effective, world-wide brotherhood, given a herculean effort, are merely to be disclosed and their implications exploited by rational organisation of existing resources. The fact is, however, that misery increases by demonstrable percentages each year (and with it frustration and rancour) while in other parts of the human family affluence accumulates (and with it self-righteousness and callousness). Such in an appallingly simplified form is the human situation which the Geneva Conference proposes to appraise and to which ever conscious of the limits of its voice, it hopes to offer a helpful, healing word.

The detailed analyses of the technical and social revolutions of our times is the work of the four sections of the Geneva Conference. These discussions will presumably be given focus by the perspectives supplied in one of the background volumes, "Christian Social Ethics in a Changing World".

Economic Development

Section 1, "Economic Development in a World Perspective," will address itself to the issues of world economic

justice whose principles, not to mention the techniques, are yet to be elaborated. Sober examination will be made of the harsh realities of the inequalities of the world's wealth with two-thirds of the population of the globe possessing an average per capita income a mere one-tenth that of the developed nations. Fluctuations of prices of raw materials, the rising cost of imported machinery, the barriers against selling semi-finished goods in the developed countries combine to nullify the loans and gifts of foreign aid. Undoubtedly the role of the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development, now a permanent agency of the undeveloped world, will be debated and its future tactics as a cohesive instrument of power for the poorer nations appraised. Apposite, too, would be a consideration of the "brain drain," the exodus of the trained professional and technical elite of the poor countries for jobs in the rich world, the subject of a suppressed report of the U.N. Special Fund directed by the Iranian sociologist, Dr. Ehsan Naraghi. Inevitable is the examination of the non-economic factors of growth, the priorities of planning and their proper determination, the distribution of burdens in raising the standards of living and the spiritual perils of affluence.

Greatly increased government initiative — and this not merely in the fields of welfare and education—its warrant and dangers will preoccupy Section 11, "The Nature and Function of the State in a Revolutionary Age". In the evolution of new political forms freedom of individuals and of cultural and religious associations must be protected and the possibility of participation provided for. But how? Are constitutional guarantees alone sufficient against the centralisation of controls imposed in the interest of national progress and unity? What validity is to be accorded extra-legal protest and non-violent political action? Are there universal criteria enabling Christians of different political situations to employ a common calculus of judgment and speak a mutually comprehensive idiom in this matter? Here undoubtedly the accents of voices from Africa and Asia speaking of the need to hurry their societies into the modern world and prepared to accept one-party regimes as

instruments of national unity will seem strange to those accustomed to the language of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence with its vast reliance on experience. At a recent meeting of the Fellows of the World Press Institute with the staff of the Centre for the Study of Democratic Institutions at Santa Barbara, California, an Iranian newsman broke in: "One thing surely must be done about the American press and American TV and American movies. They must be censored. They must be controlled by government"! Here, too, will be heard the exasperation with the institutionalised injustices of Latin America, the resentful repudiation of existing political structures and the acceptances of the radical means to remake society to the profit of the dispossessed.

World without War

Peace in a nuclear age is the underlying theme of Section III, "The Search for New Patterns of International Cooperation in a Pluralistic World". But while the preservation of peace will probably dominate the Section, the means of building a more stable, more economically just world society will evoke the deepest thinking. For here all the issues which come before the United Nations, plus those never submitted to it, as well as the functioning of the United Nations itself are included in the agenda. Within the limits of its resources the World Council's Commission of the Churches for International Affairs has been studying these issues and alerting its constituency. We have, perhaps without realising it, arrived at the post-war world and must ask ourselves what is the present-day significance of opposing ideologies and systems of social organisation in a world growing geographically a single neighbourhood? How is the present ineffective international authority to be strengthened and adapted to achieving peaceful changes in the world? What are the techniques of co-operation across competing value systems and national interests? What are the political instrumentalities for reducing economic inequalities between rich and poor nations? How is both the power of the strong and the dynamism of the new nations to be channelled to larger purposes? The list of allied issues is almost endless: the limits of national

sovereignty, the building of mutual trust, the role of the rule of law, arms control, racial tensions, regional political institutions, protection of minorities, etc. But more basic to the purposes of the Geneva Conference will be the disclosure of the theological roots and the task of the churches in developing a common ethos and a moderation of power to assist the patient, inch-by-inch move from international disorder to a more operative world community.

A Necessary Casualty?

Whatever the exact scope envisaged by the planning committee of the Geneva Conference for Section IV, "Man and Community in Changing Societies," it will turn, I surmise into a forum on the extent and effects of secularism, of "man's coming of age" in Dietrich Bonhoeffer's phrase, of the meaning of "religionless Christianity". The theme is fashionable in contemporary theology and inevitably so. The triumphs of technology and the emergence of new patterns of social living have disassociated men from nature, from his group, from traditional values. The evolution is connected, historically at least, with a vast and squalid urbanization whose proportions are bewildering. Thus, it is projected that the already miserable populations of the cities of Asia, Africa and Latin America will double in 15 years. Is man a necessary casualty of this process, displaced because depersonalized, alienated because unattached except to an insecure economic role? What, moreover, is the future of moral sanctions when their traditional sources are impugned and spiritual authority replaced by the pressure of external conformity? Or, more hopefully, may one see in this revolutionary change in structures and attitudes the liberation of man from submission to outmoded cultural forms and a common summons to a challenge that John Fitzgerald Kennedy understood in his Inaugural Address. On this earth, the President reminded his listeners, God's work passes through the hands of men. Are the new forms of community to be sought? Perhaps not those of a closed clannishness but of common service with God's continuing creation a sacred commitment to the construction of a more fraternal city?

Theological Problems

What can be expected from the coming Geneva Conference on Church and Society? The diversity of opinion in the ecumenical family warns against any expectation of stunning new pronouncements or striking solutions. Indeed, the danger of elaborating banalities to avoid divergence and to express easy agreement is real. At the outset the Conference is confronted with a quandary described by Robert S. Bilheimer, former Associate General Secretary of the World Council: "Because the theological situation within the churches is nearly chaotic, the theological problem of the conference is gigantic". Not only are there uncertainties as to the manner of interpreting the Bible but the accusation is at large that traditional Christian ethics is a residue of a defunct Christendom and an instrument of colonialism. Nor can the mistrust, even the mockery of the young people who today constitute half the population of the world be forgotten. In larger and vocal numbers they proclaim their disaffection towards all forms of ancient wisdom, their disbelief in the sincerity, or at least, the effectiveness of all institutional ecclesiastical effort in a world of revolution.

Great act of Faith

The Conference on Church and Society is at a minimum a great act of faith in God's abiding concern for the world he has made, and in the inescapable responsibilities of the followers of his Son to discern and implement his purposes in service to their brothers everywhere. Whatever the achievements of the Geneva Conference, its purposes are clear. They have been expressed by the Rev. Paul Abrecht who has carried the major burden of the preparations: "Our main aim will be to show by our discussions and our concern and action that we as Christians care deeply and realistically; that we want to share the burdens of our neighbours in the whole human community; that we are not content with the *status quo* but that we truly seek to live in the knowledge of God who has encompassed all and who wills that all men shall know him and his love and mercy".

CURRENT COMMENT

Although the principles of laissez-faire capitalism have been abandoned, the legal constitution of the English company still contains elements of this economic theory. This defect in law leads to distributive injustice on a very great scale. Father Maxwell documents his argument, and shows the only way in which a useful dialogue can begin between communist and capitalist.

Liberalism and Property

JOHN FRANCIS MAXWELL

ONE explanation for the absence of any radical adjustment of the law, for the specific purpose of securing an equitable distribution of the benefits of increases in productivity and capital, at the time of the industrial revolution, can be found in the philosophy of economic liberalism which prevailed in the XIXth Century. For it was the error of secular liberalism in Europe and the United States at that time which took it for granted that neither the divinely-provided laws of morality nor the man-made laws and institutions of the State were necessary in order that property and income should be fairly distributed. According to this theory there was a pre-arranged harmony in the market economy which obviated the need for any control, either internal and moral or external and legal, over economic decisions and contracts. This theory taught that the enterprising industrialist need not be accountable to anyone (except occasionally to the investors if he lost their money) for his economic decisions, since the mechanism of the profit-motive or financial incentive in conditions of economic growth and free market competition was self-regulating, and it *automatically* led to the greatest benefit not only for the investors but also for consumers,

employees and the general public. This theory presupposed, in other words, contrary to elementary common sense, that the absence of the external constraint of law as well as the internal constraint of morality from economic decisions would lead to distributive justice in a growing national economy.

Errors enshrined in Company Law

The economists began to discard the erroneous theory of economic liberalism nearly a century ago. But at least in English law, the basic institution and structure of the English company still contains elements which remain as a legal memorial to erroneous XIXth century economic theory. The business enterprise had been functioning adequately in a static economy; but it was malfunctioning under the new conditions of dynamic national economic growth. It was malfunctioning contrary to the public interest in so far as it was the crystallisation in law of the XIXth century theory of economic liberalism. Company law in England for example, in 1862, and still in 1948, took it for granted that what is in the financial interest of the shareholders will automatically also be in the interest of the consumers and the employees, and furthermore will also automatically be in the public interest of the nation and of the world at large. This is clearly a relic of the theory of the self-regulating free market economy of liberal economic theory.

The usual admission expressed by the supporters of our English capitalist system is that the system contains "abuses". But surely an error which is written in to the law itself cannot properly be called an "abuse". For in English company law it is entirely in accordance with the law that the interests of the consumers and the employees, as well as the public interest, should be subordinated to the interests of the shareholders.

If this defect in the law, and in the institution of the industrial company which is created by the law, necessarily leads to distributive injustice and the infringement of natural moral immunities, or necessarily leads to higher human interests and human values being subordinated to

financial interests and financial values, then such a defect is not an abuse; it is an *injustice* and is contrary to the public interest. However, in practice, very few business men will ever recognise any provision of corporation law as being morally unjust; for the majority take it for granted that, in a competitive economy, whatever is permitted by law must be just, and that even if they refrain from doing something that the law permits them to do, their competitors will not be so scrupulous.

Philosophical errors

Looking at economic liberalism from the philosophical, not from the political point of view, one can see that its central error consists in making profitability, or the maximum return on investment, into an absolute directive for human affairs. Profitability becomes an idol which directs the investor and the industrialist and tells them what they may do and what they may not do. For philosophically speaking, in the moral order of what is just and unjust, God is that unique Being who by His own Absolute Authority can direct what men may or may not do. The *laissez-faire* capitalist who puts economic liberalism into practice is therefore guilty of a sort of idolatry in so far as he makes profitability the criterion of what is good or bad behaviour. In their theory, of course, the supporters of economic liberalism exclude any consideration of justice or morality; but in their practice, their idol of profitability decides for them what they may or may not do.

But economic liberalism contains another fatal defect. This idea of a pre-arranged harmony in the market economy puts man himself on the same level as all the other pieces and forces in the economic mechanism. The economic liberal philosophy which leads in practice to *laissez-faire* capitalism is both mechanistic and materialistic. It inverts the natural hierarchy of human values which is established by the natural moral laws, in so far as it makes financial motives supreme in the economic order. But there are many other natural incentives for mankind besides the financial one, some of them of much higher dignity and worth for human society. It is not in the public interest

that the financial incentive should be the sole of supreme regulating factor in human affairs.

Increasing gap between Rich and Poor

In fact, as everyone knows, the economic and industrial world is not a pure mechanism for producing and distributing wealth; and in practice, even the static economy of the middle ages called for human institutions and laws to regulate wages, prices, and the return on invested capital. All the more, therefore, will a dynamically growing economy in the era of an industrial revolution call for new human institutions and adequate new laws to regulate the distribution of a national wealth which is increasing rapidly every year. The human and economic consequences of the failure to regulate a dynamically growing economy can be truly disastrous. *Laissez-faire* capitalism means in practice that the existing gap between rich people and poor people, between employers and employees, cannot merely remain relatively the same, but it can actually increase.

Under a free market economy, with the financial incentive as the motivation which is allowed to prevail over all other natural incentives, and with a free movement both of capital and labour, an increasing gap between rich and poor is certainly an effect of unregulated national economic growth.

Statistics concerning Chile

Here is some recent evidence about Latin America compiled from three different sources. Chile is a poor country economically speaking. In the 12 years approximately between 1946 and 1958, the average Chilean did not merely remain poor; he actually became poorer. Here are the official figures provided by the Chilean Ministry of Agriculture and Development Centre. They were quoted by all the Bishops of Chile in their Joint Pastoral Letter, dated 18th September, 1962. During those 12 years the average yearly consumption of meat per person in Chile was reduced from 52.8 kilos to 33.9 kilos; the average daily consumption of protein per person in Chile was reduced from 30.2 gms. to 26 gms. causing an average daily protein

deficiency in the diet of 15 gms. The poorest classes in Chile grew poorer than these statistics indicate, since these figures refer to all the inhabitants of Chile, rich as well as poor.

These statistics are confirmed by the United Nations "Economic Survey of Latin America, 1957" ⁽¹⁾ where it is shown that the drop in the real income of employed persons in Chile (who constitute 65 per cent of all consumers) in the years prior to 1957, forced them to change their demand structure in order to maintain their former level of food consumption.

There was an almost universal decrease in the intake of better-quality foodstuffs and a relative increase in the consumption of staple food items. During this period investment hardly sufficed—and sometimes did not suffice—to cover the annual depreciation in the stock of capital. But Chilean employers and investors did not suffer. Large-scale Chilean industrialists used a significant proportion of their profits for purchasing farms. Residential building, mainly of a luxury type, came to absorb 45 per cent of fixed investment in 1955.

Foreign investors in Chile likewise did not suffer during this period. Here are the official figures for United States direct investment in Chile. Earnings of branches and subsidiaries of United States corporations in Chile during the 10 years from 1951 to 1960 totalled about 594 million dollars. Of those earnings about 59 million dollars were reinvested in the same or other branches or subsidiaries in Chile, and about 554 million dollars were remitted back to the benefit of the stockholders in the United States and elsewhere. During the same 10 years new direct investment in these branches and subsidiaries in Chile totalled about 212 million dollars. There was therefore a net outflow from Chile to the corporations of 554 less 212, or about 342 million dollars during these ten years. And the book value of these investments increased from 540 million dollars in 1950 to 738 million dollars in 1960, an increase of 198 million dollars which did not directly benefit the

(1) Chapter VI on Chile.

people of Chile, since the assets of these corporations remained in the beneficial ownership of the stockholders.⁽²⁾ But during all this time, while the foreign investors and Chilean industrialists and investors grew richer, the poor people of Chile, comprising 65 per cent of the population, grew poorer. They grew poorer in spite of the fact that between 1950 and 1957 the Chilean gross product showed some increase.

Trade Unions and Redistributory Taxation

Historically, in the XIXth century, a number of checks or countervailing forces did arise after the industrial revolution, either spontaneously or by legislative action, in order to correct the imbalances and distributive injustices resulting from *laissez-faire* capitalism. The trade union arose spontaneously in Britain, first as an illegal organisation, later as a legalised institution, to counter the aggressive exploitation of employees by avaricious managers and masters. Its original purpose was simply to fight so that increases in real wages should not lag too far behind increases in productivity. Parliament later imposed redistributory taxation, in the form of progressive income taxes, and inheritance taxes, in order to transfer wealth from the rich to the poor by way of welfare benefits. The Factory Acts were designed to mitigate the unfair working conditions imposed by competitive *laissez-faire* capitalism. But all these countervailing forces were merely plastering the running sore. Even so, it was precisely these two built-in elements in *laissez-faire* capitalism which kept the inequitable system from utter instability. And it is an interesting commentary on the capitalist mentality that the two loudest complaints of the wealthy minority were directed precisely against "union monopoly power" and "excessive taxation of the rich"!

Palliatives not Enough

One is tempted to ask how many more millions of children and adults in poor countries must suffer or die from under-

⁽²⁾ U.S. Department of Commerce. *Balance of Payments, Statistical supplement, Revised Edition. 1963, Tables 49, 51, 52, 55, 57.*

nourishment before the experts in the rich countries find adequate legal remedies for this international free market economy which, under conditions of world economic expansion, enables the rich nations and classes to grow richer and leaves the poor nations and classes to become poorer. It is here suggested that mere palliatives and countervailing forces which leave the basic free market economy unchanged, are quite inadequate as remedies since they do not touch the root cause of the distributive injustice. It should be repeated again that not only company law but also the law of master and servant and the law of landlord and tenant should have been adjusted in all countries in the second half of the XIXth century (at the time when political economists were beginning to abandon the theories of economic liberalism), if the evils caused by maldistribution of property and income were to have been avoided.

Door opened to communist Propaganda

It was the public and widespread evil effects of the practice of economic liberalism, that is to say, maldistribution of the benefits of economic growth and the attendant unjust infringements of human rights, which left the door wide open for Marxist-socialist propaganda to find a ready hearing amongst impoverished XIXth century working people. And it is these same evil effects of economic liberalism, mitigated as they are in some countries by powerful trade unions and redistributory taxation, which are still provoking the ready acceptance of communist propaganda amongst poorer people in so many countries at the present time.

Yet analysing any communist propaganda from the point of view of the natural moral law, one can understand its strong appeal. Communist propaganda can tell the working class, in other terminology, of course, that their property rights are being infringed by distributive injustice. It can remind the working class that this deprivation of property and incomes leads to infringement of their higher human rights, their marital rights to live in a decent private dwelling, their bodily rights to adequate nourishment and basic human needs, their parental rights, their

vocational rights to a chosen occupation and leisure, their intellectual rights to education, and finally their religious rights to worship God. All these human rights can be and in fact sometimes are infringed by the operation of the liberal market economy. What is the answer of Communism to this class injustice? Communist propaganda tells the working class that they should do three things. Firstly, they should be ready to sacrifice their natural rights over productive or useful property for the sake of preserving their higher human rights. Secondly they should themselves infringe the natural and legal rights and authority of their employers, landlords, and governments, in order to set up a State which will exercise exclusive rights over all national productive or useful property for the sake of the community as a whole. Thirdly, as a result of the philosophical determinism which is at the basis of dialectical materialism, Communism demands the renunciation and denial of all religious rights; in other words, under the perfect communist State people will no longer completely exercise their freewill.

Dialogue between Capitalists and Communists

These three points need to be understood in all their economic, philosophical, and psychological implications, if any dialogue at any level between the supporters of *laissez-faire* capitalism and the supporters of Marxist-socialism is ever to be fruitful.⁽³⁾ What needs to be pointed out to the supporters of *laissez-faire* capitalism is the genuine reality of the maldistribution of property today, the real distributive injustice, which is the direct and inevitable effect of the operation of economic liberalism in a national economy which is growing at, say, 4 per cent compound per annum; that is the *economic* fact. What also needs to be pointed out is the genuine reality of the infringement of higher spiritual human rights which is the direct and inevitable effect of poor people becoming even poorer. As innumerable Catholic Bishops have pointed out in Joint Pastoral Letters over the last forty years, there is a level of human

⁽³⁾ See Pope John XXIII. Encyclical Letter *Pacem in Terris*, April 11th, 1963, paragraph 160.

impoverishment below which it becomes morally impossible for the average human person to lead a spiritual life and respond to religious motivation. That is the *philosophical* fact. Thirdly, what also needs to be pointed out to the supporters of *laissez-faire* capitalism is the genuine reality of the psychological provocation which is the effect of distributive injustice of all sorts especially distributive injustice in regard to property. Unfortunately, not all very poor people are saints and can suffer distributive injustice, not merely for a time but for a lifetime, without becoming envious, avaricious and rebellious; that is the *psychological* fact.

Statisticians tell us that some 20 or 30 million people a year are nowadays suffering excessive poverty before they finally die of undernourishment.

On the other hand, what needs to be pointed out to the supporters of Marxist-socialism is that there is no need to sacrifice their natural rights over productive or useful property in order to safeguard their higher human rights, *provided that* the State can supply adequate legislation and institutions to regulate the growing national economy, so that there is distributive justice in relation to growing incomes and growing capital assets. Secondly, what needs to be pointed out to the supporters of Marxist-socialism is that there is no need to instigate a revolution against the proper legal authorities of employers, landlords, and governments in order to achieve distributive justice, *provided that* governments, landlords and employers exercise their authority justly, that is to say, in the public interest, as opposed to sectional or private interests. Thirdly, what needs to be pointed out to the supporters of Marxist-socialism, is that there is no call to deny or infringe religious rights *provided that* religious authorities are impartial and do not appear to favour the interests of the rich and neglect the interests of the poor. For in fact the Judaeo-Christian tradition of religious teaching is objectively right and just provided that its principles of justice are correctly applied under the modern conditions of growing national economies.

And most of all, there is no call to replace the idolatry of

profitability by the idolatry of the State. For looking at this socialism from the ethical point of view, its central error consists in making the State into an Absolute Authority which directs all citizens down to the last detail of their economic activities, and tells them what they may do and what they may not do. Under Marxist-socialism, the advantage of the State replaces profitability as the ultimate source and criterion of justice and morality.

It is possibly along these lines, and in the context of human rights and the natural moral law and distributive justice that a dialogue might be fruitful for both sides, and both capitalists and communists might come to some mutual outstanding of what they mean by a "national purpose" and the goals of human and world society.

Moments of Crystallization

"In all writers there occurs a moment of crystallization when the dominant theme is plainly expressed, when the private universe becomes visible even to the least sensitive reader. Such a crystallization is Hardy's often-quoted phrase: 'The President of the Immortals . . . had ended his sport with Tess' . . . It is less easy to find such a crystallization in the works of (Henry) James . . . but I think we may take the sentence in the scenario of *The Ivory Tower*, in which James speaks of 'the black and merciless things that are behind great possessions' as an expression of the ruling fantasy which drove him to write: a sense of evil religious in its intensity."—Graham Greene (*The Lost Childhood and Other Essays*).

Unless we meet with loving response from others we are not persons. We are rejected. We are nothing. So therefore in responding to others, as Christians we are compelled to learn to control our tongues. If we are vicious slander-mongers our profession of religion is a disgusting sham. Let us make sure that we do not, by word or action, give to any man the final thrust into bitterness and despair.

Search for Certainty

E. L. WAY

THE search begins before one leaves the cradle: the desire for certainty of food, warmth, and the love associated with these things. And it ends at last in the grave. We know now the damage that can be caused psychologically to the infant who is separated from his mother before the age of three. You will note this for yourself if you go to a children's hospital and see some of the lost little souls there. When I went my six-month-old baby had just been operated on and a little child, her small fingers on one hand enormous in bandages, followed me round the ward holding my hand. The large deep brown eyes were more movingly eloquent in their profound appeal than any words could ever say. God knows what three-year-old misery lay at the root of that infant's being. But it is seven years since I saw that child and I doubt if I shall ever forget the look in her eyes. After talking to her for a while, and carrying her in my arms, I put her down gently, seeking by stealth almost to disengage the bond which momentarily held us, fearful that I should add one more bruise to that hurt little soul. Please God, she found what she was so obviously looking for.

Not a Person

Unless one meets with another's whole-hearted response,

one's very identity is menaced. One is not a person. In the world of the spirit we are, in such cases, like those unfortunate stateless people who are condemned to live out their lives on boats, say on the Danube, prohibited from landing in any country. I remember, years ago, reading of one such pitiful convoy. How their stateless existence ended I never discovered. But they became for me a symbol of man's eternal quest for certainty. Rejected at every point from setting our feet on solid ground, we redirect our hopes from one withheld goal to the next. And if this is true for the successful people of this world, for those who are established in their homelands, in their jobs, and in their neighbourhoods, how much more true is it of the outsiders: for those who have not settled because they will never be accepted anywhere ?

Society's Rejects

They may be rejects from society: the criminal, the failure, the inadequate, the person with the blood of three or four nations striving for mastery in his veins, the man who hasn't found his proper place in this world, and who knows he never will. A woman, for example, in this category may have failed dismally as a wife, and never have been a mother. A man may, after a desperately sad struggle, have accepted his rejection, but it hurts him intensely to discover that the same knife which he has carried in his back is now being manipulated skilfully before it is plunged into the back of his adolescent daughter. The world is a brutal place. And the tragic fact is that some who consider themselves Christians are often the worst brutes to be found in it. The skill with which, in discussing a decent family, in a casual aside perhaps in a sentence of seven words, they will introduce their deadly malice is far from enviable. Do they know that they are spoiling, or trying to spoil, the life of another ? While God alone can judge the subjective nature of their guilt, the enormity of what they do is beyond question. They see a man struggling in the water frantically and they not only do not help but joyfully push him under. A delightful girl, eligible in every way, is damned by a remark. "You know, of course, her father is an alcoholic."

Or "Her mother," with a grimace, "is a neurotic." Or, worse still, with an air of charitable doubt, and suspended judgment, "I don't know, but it is said that there is an Indian in the family."

Enough Dirt

Throw enough dirt and some is bound to stick. And as most of us have a skeleton in the cupboard, some complete, some with only a thigh-bone or a scrap of skull, or a few teeth, no one is safe for very long. And even if there is no skeleton, one can always be planted—there in the dark to do its grisly work. Long and strenuous practice has perfected the human race in character assassination. The sword and the duelling pistols are outlawed but the barbed word can easily cause a festering place in the mind. (The victim is either furiously angry or profoundly dejected. And deep dejection of this sort, the psychologists tell us, is a masked form of savage resentment. Only the fool shrugs off the slander that is quietly circulating in the neighbourhood.) The town may have put an end to the tribe but the tribal nastiness survives. And the tribal nastiness of the English is in a class of its own.

Such a Background

With this background, aptly described by the Romans as the war of all against all, is it any wonder that we are always searching for certainty, looking for sanctuary, seeking out some corner of a foreign field that is for ever Christian? We may seek it in the parish only to discover that some of the sharpest tongues we ever met with are there beside us in Church declaring loudly in the Creed that they believe in the Communion of Saints. We may search for it in friendship in which we look at least for acceptance or kindness. Few, alas, make lifelong friends. The friendship may have begun in the comradeship of the army, or in the local industrial factory barracks, or over a few drinks in the pub, but few such friendships come to anything. Friendship is such an easy victim of circumstances: it may end in a transfer from one town to another, or in that enormous graveyard of masculine friendships—

marriage. But however often it ends it is a dispirited person who entirely gives up hope of some day somewhere coming across an enduring friendship. Most happily it may develop with our married partner, or with our growing sons and daughters, with their wives and husbands. And here it is not quite such a frail bloom, not often subject to the icy winds of malicious gossip. But much more likely to be damaged by the frictions engendered by daily living in close contact with others.

Ultimate Loneliness

With time we come to realise the essential loneliness of the human situation. The physical struggle and loneliness of birth are mercifully forgotten but easily surmised. The loneliness involved in living in our industrial suburban hells we read about too often and grow accustomed to. And we have a shrewd suspicion that we shall make our end in some hospital ward amidst the distant clatter of the hospital food-trolley, and the ever-present racket of some drivel on the television. Have we not seen others dying amidst the uproar of a televised boatrace? The Christian soul was not bid to go forth to Oxbridge alleluias but did so nevertheless. It is most curious that modern man thus living and dying in a lonely disinterested crowd should not turn to God, or to whatever consolations his discarded religion might afford. And if he does turn to it he still has to go on shedding hopes: hopes for an occasional sign from heaven: a touch of the supernatural in his waste of wordly days, a hope for certainty in all his religious beliefs, for if once a belief is first questioned and then abandoned the stain of disbelief spreads like blood upon cotton wool.

Hopes

Confronted by this ultimate loneliness many forget all about it. They get on with their work, build up their careers, give their sons the best education they cannot afford, and then resign themselves to whatever will be. Seeing reality for an odd moment they choose not to see it, but look away. Others pin their faith on political parties and work for and dream of the changes that the future

will bring. But however naive they may be they know in their heart of hearts that government will for a long time to come remain what it has ever been: a conspiracy of the privileged to hang on to their privileges with tenacity, and to pass on these privileges to their posterity. (The present Labour Government elected largely by working-class votes constructs an Incomes Policy in two parts: one for the professional classes who get their thousand-a-year increase—doctors, dentists, ministers of the crown, judges, members of Parliament—and in the second part are placed the Railwaymen, seamen, and teachers who get next to nothing because they will upset the policy. If the nation is in a bad way economically we must all tighten our belts. The rich should not become richer, and the poor much worse off. Any attempt by the Railwaymen to “brain-drain” off to Australia would soon be met by an Essential Works Order.) Anything which has been won for the disinherited has been shaken off the rich man’s table by the Income Tax inspector. For the wealthy only think of Abraham’s bosom when expiring in the seclusion of their private wards. Knowing this too well, without being stirred up by hatred or malice, the sensible Christian must keep up a steady pressure for the improvement of the lot of the poor. We have the certainty that God’s justice will be finally meted out to the last farthing in spite of the doubts and headshakings of experts of all kinds.

Living Heart of Goodness

I apologise for the sombre strain of these reflections during a period given over to holidays and hoped for sunshine. But one can’t see an innocent person struck down by the most vicious slander without wondering what our faith can possibly mean to some people. If we have not learned to control our tongues our religion is nothing but a disgusting sham. St. Thomas Aquinas sums it up cogently: “He who is without love lacks the living heart of goodness: he should be diagnosed as spiritually dead . . . The blessed apostle John asserts that the whole spiritual life consists in friendship: we know that we have passed from death to life, because we love the brethren.”

MONTHLY REPORT

In this article Maureen Nyhan gives an absorbing account of the Californians. Living in the promised land they have a high suicide rate. They are generous with delightful manners, hard-working, enthusiastic, ignorant of foreign affairs, and dangerously conformist, worshipping daily the Stars and Stripes.

The Golden State

MAUREEN NYHAN

ACCORDING to the fifteenth century Spanish novel, *Las Sergas de Esplandian*, California was a mythical garden situated somewhere near Eden, abundant in gold and precious stones, and inhabited by beautiful, Amazon-like women. So it is, perhaps, not surprising to find the name coming into general use shortly after Francisco de Ulloa's voyage in 1539. It must have seemed to these early explorers that the old story had somehow come true, for California must surely be among the most beautiful places in the world. The coincidence persists, strangely, over the years, for the imagined riches were real, after all: in a hundred years this state produced two billion dollars worth of gold. Nature so obviously intended these people to be among the happiest, richest, most peaceful of humans, that to the newcomer it is something of a shock to realise that this is not the Garden of Eden. It only looks like that.

High Suicide Rate

The first suspicion that all is not what it seems dawns in the first few weeks, with the discovery that it is extraordinarily difficult to find a native-born Californian. A thousand newcomers enter the state every day, and the greater Los Angeles population is rivalling that of New York. The 1960 negro population of 883,861 represents an

increase of 91.3 per cent since 1950. In the same period the Japanese, the second largest non-white group, showed an increase of 85.3 per cent, and the Chinese, the Filipinos and the Indians continue to come in significantly large groups. On the Mexican border there is a constant flow of poverty-stricken families, waiting with pathetic eagerness to cross over into the 'golden state'. Then why, one asks, is the suicide rate in San Francisco so appallingly high? The answer which comes with significant frequency is that this city has failed to preserve its Mecca-image in the eyes of the restless, the ambitious, the romantic, who have come seeking a haven and even in the Californian sun have not found it. Why did the violence in Watts reach such terrifying proportions? Organised political agitation, the heat-wave, poverty—there are many answers, but among them one finds again the element of disillusionment, in the presence of so many Southern negroes who had hoped to find Los Angeles a kinder world, and found it another white man's city.

In the ranks of the established white Californians one would expect to find an attitude of comfortable stability. These are people who can lie in the sun and know they will never be hungry. It is true that automation and fluctuating defence expenditure at Californian aerospace plants and military installations have strongly affected at least three major industries, construction, transportation, and the retail trades (which, significantly, show the biggest increase in Labour Union membership, according to the most recent figures available). But the shift towards white-collar, skilled employment continues, and employment is stable enough to permit women to form about one-third of all employed persons. Yet the overwhelming impression, as one observes these people at work, or in their 'vacation' resorts, is one of constant anxiety.

Delightful Manners and Generosity

This manifests itself in unexpected ways. They are anxious, for example, that a stranger, and particularly a European, shall have a good impression of their state and their country. They will go to great lengths to welcome

him, to make sure he is not lonely, that he is able to visit local beauty spots or places of historical interest. Their manners, for which they often apologise, are delightful, and one wonders sadly whether the European metropolis takes the same pride in hospitality when these Californians travel abroad. Their desire to please, in fact, can be embarrassing. What does one say to a Californian Professor of Literature who observes, "Of course, we realise that as a people we have produced almost no literature to compare with yours"? How does one convince a charming and successful Californian business-woman that Europeans do not necessarily despise all architecture that is less than four hundred years old? How, indeed, can one tactfully suggest that these people should stop trying to revive the apparent glamour of the lost Indian and Spanish days, and begin to value themselves for their own very real talents? They are enthusiastic, hard-working, generous and idealistic, and in the present welter of apathy and cynicism these are valuable characteristics.

This feeling of rootlessness, of inadequacy, shows itself in the constant pursuit of perfection, and if one is sometimes appalled by their conception of what is perfect, at least one is impressed by their enthusiasm. The Californian adoration of the body beautiful is transmitted to the young at a very early stage; the women are almost obsessively occupied by clothes and cosmetics, and if the result lacks individuality, it is an attractive mass-production; elderly businessmen devote themselves with equal energy to the pursuit of health and vigour, and this may account for the fact that much of Californian conversation is devoted to ulcers, diets, and the need to postpone the ageing process.

Physical beauty, say these perfectionists, depends largely on mental health, and so an incredible number of Californians are, to use their own phrase, 'in therapy'. It costs \$25 an hour for a private session with a psychiatrist or psychologist (the distinction here is often vague) and \$8 or \$10 an hour for group therapy. I have the deepest respect for accredited, responsible psychiatry, but it is clear that far too many of these patients regard the 'doctor' as

a substitute conscience, someone who will lead them safely and painlessly to Perfect Mental Poise.

Marriage, too, has its perfectionist element. Four out of five marriages here end in divorce, a fact which seems to leave the average Californian unmoved. "It takes one marriage to make you grow up," one young woman told me, "and then you have a better chance of making the second work." And a better chance still, one assumes, for succeeding with the third, and the fourth and so on.

Pornography, Experiment and Violence

In this atmosphere, it is not surprising that sex, too, is used as an escapist device. Pornography here is certainly no worse than it is in England, but it is more easily available. Children who go to buy candy at the super-market can also amuse themselves at the bookstall, which invariably carries magazines with brazenly pornographic covers. In at least one widely-circulated journal, serious writing of a very high standard is augmented by pull-out pages offering 'art pieces' for the attention of the reader. In England such productions are passed discreetly from hand to hand, or posted in plain covers. Here they are to be found on open sale beside the children's comic books.

Sexual experimenting among the youth seems to cause no more and no less concern to the authorities than it does in, for example, London, but again it is more openly acknowledged. To be young and potent is the Ideal constantly placed before these youngsters, and this, coupled with the prevailing contempt for the virtue of fidelity, results in an inevitable wildness and instability among the young people.

They are healthy and free. Above all, they are free, and they do not like authority. Lawlessness and violence runs through Californian history from the time of the Spanish military, through the tragic story of the Indians, and into the vicious days of the gold rush. Here there is nothing to parallel the peaceful, good-humoured war between citizens and police that one finds in Britain. A 'cop' means trouble. He comes speeding down the highway, sirens screaming, and when he jumps out on to the side-walk one

is immediately conscious of the gun in his belt. It is much easier here than it is in Britain to find yourself, at least technically, a felon, and your chances of a night in jail are correspondingly higher. Resentment, therefore, is mute, and because the 'cop' is human, he probably shouts more loudly because of it. It is easy to complain that he should mingle with the public, that he should appear as a protector as well as a punitive agent. One must remember that there are more hidden guns in a Californian crowd than in a British one. There are other pressures, too, with which the policeman has to contend. I asked a young car-salesman why he had left the police force after only two years. "I got shot at twice," he said. "I had to shoot at a man once, and anyway, I didn't like the politics."

Concentrated Mass-patriotism

All this is a long way from the ideal Golden State, and one begins to understand the Californian's joy when he perceives that at least there is nothing to prevent him from being a perfect patriot. There may be faults in his society, but none of these can harm the Flag, for this is greater even than California.

The worship of the Stars and Stripes, the frequent incantation of the pledge of allegiance, is, to the visiting Englishman, somewhat embarrassing. He has been brought up to believe that one's flag should be flown discreetly on special occasions, and that no well-brought up person ever says things like, "I love my country". He may love it passionately, but that is not the point. Every morning, in the schools, the Flag goes up, and the chant rises: "One nation, under God, indivisible . . .". One watches five-year-olds, eyes fixed on the flag, chubby hands placed vaguely in the region of their hearts, and it is impossible to prevent the word 'Indoctrination' creeping into one's mind. To Western European eyes, this concentrated mass-patriotism holds an element of all-too familiar danger. The coloured high school student chants with the rest: ". . . with liberty and justice for all". He gives no sign that he knows it is the custom in certain Los Angeles restaurants to print two menus, one for white customers and one for black. The

'black' menu quotes prices exactly double those on the white one, and is an effectively peaceable way of ensuring that only the white customers return.

Safer to Conform

Yet to most Californians the Flag is the untarnished symbol of their ideal, a land of peace and freedom, the saviour of the world, the Perfect Country. In the pursuit of this ideal, California has bred more political extremists than any other state. If you believe passionately that the freedom of the world depends upon the purity of the American vision, then the purifying process must be constant and effective. "They call me a Red," one man told me. "They say I picked up Commie ideas in London. You want to know why? Because in London, in Hyde Park, I realised that I was seeing free speech in action for the first time in my life. We have nothing comparable here. You want to keep your job, you want promotion, then you'd better have the right ideas, and say the right things, and you'd better make sure your wife and the rest of the family follow you." I have no way of telling how fair or unfair this comment is, but it is clear that it carries at least a germ of truth. A student who preaches pacifism will automatically be labelled either 'Red' or 'chicken' and accused of draft-dodging; a shop-steward who fights for better working conditions and resorts at last to strike action will be told he is no patriot; a teacher who suggests to seventeen-year-olds that in order to learn the meaning of tolerance they must examine other creeds, other codes, may be described as a "subversive". In all three cases the accusations may be correct, but it is equally possible that they are utterly and cruelly wrong. It is safer to conform.

The John Birch Society can claim only 60,000 members and even in California its extremist policies have attracted much criticism. Yet it is hardly possible to condemn the Society outright, without laying oneself open to charges of pro-Communist leanings.

Abysmal Ignorance of Foreign Affairs

The stranger feels this intolerance of tolerance most

keenly if he comes from a society where it is customary to exchange ideas freely, but it does explain, to a certain extent, why the average Californian is so abysmally ill-informed on affairs outside his own state. The Eastern States constitute a "foreign" country, so much so that recent attempts to circulate the *New York Times* in California met with utter failure. The racial problems in the Southern States are a constant source of bewilderment to these people who have had, until recently, no colour problem, and therefore no experience in dealing with such questions. This insular mentality shows itself most clearly in international affairs. There are many voices raised to support the idea of an invasion of Cuba in order to rescue the people from Communism, but it is difficult to find a Californian who knows or cares what happened in the streets of Budapest in 1956. One is constantly asked if the British support the American action in Vietnam, but it is almost impossible to convince them that the twelve-year war waged by the British in Malaya is in any way relevant to the Vietnam question. Incredibly, one hears again and again the impatient question: "Why don't some of these people fight their own battles, instead of leaving it all to the U.S.?" Yet in spite of the impressive work being carried out not very far away at the University of Seattle, Washington, work which will preserve the history of Tibet, the Dalai Lama seems almost unknown here, and there is no sign that the story of the magnificent courage of the Panchen Lama has penetrated into California. The Common Market is frequently discussed, but the word Comecon evokes only a puzzled silence. Children in school receive beautifully printed "news readers," in which the work of the U.S. in Asia and Africa is detailed step by step; there is no mention of the past and present contribution made by any other nation, and no tribute paid to the efforts and initiative of the people of these under-developed areas.

"March of Dimes"

Yet despite this outrageously chauvinistic attitude, Californians are deeply concerned by international problems.

European cynicism may tend to underestimate the power of this world conscience, the acceptance of anti-poverty schemes as a social duty. Big business, whatever its national origin, is always less than altruistic, but ordinary Californians, with their abundance of health and prosperity, are acutely conscious of the hunger in the world, and they give generously. It would be unjust to reduce this to terms of a pampered society trying to solve its conscience by doling out easily-afforded funds for the less fortunate. There is a complete lack of arrogance in their constant "March of Dimes" schemes, in their support of the Peace Corps, in their energetic attempts to alleviate suffering. They are often puzzled and hurt by the cynicism of more sophisticated societies in regard to these efforts; they do not understand why others do not share their optimism, their certainty that the world can be made a happier place.

Already they have learned one lesson, that though a nation may buy economic influence, it cannot buy political wisdom, and one of their most engaging characteristics is their readiness to admit that they lack experience in the world theatre. They also admit, thoughtfully, that they do not know what it is to be bombed in their own city streets, to watch alien troops marching through their country; still less do they know what it is to be afraid of a knock at the door after dark. In this one sense, they do not really know what freedom is. And so they retain an ideal which Europeans have, for the most part, put away with childish things. Their vision of the world as it can be is very like the "California" of that old Spanish story, an illusion, perhaps, but an ideal to be striven for. One American commentator observes perceptively that while California may not be the Promised Land, it is still very much a land of promise.

INDUSTRIAL ANGLE

Dr. Jackson sets out here some of the principles which should govern the decision to strike: the effects on innocent parties, a just cause, and sympathetic action by other unions. He also examines the influence of a member of the Prices and Incomes Board being appointed to the Court of Inquiry.

The Seamen's Strike

J. M. JACKSON

BY the time this article appears, the strike will no doubt belong to past history, though at the moment of writing it is difficult to see by what means a settlement is to be reached. As with a good many other intractable disputes in the past, the Minister of Labour has appointed a Court of Inquiry. Very often these Courts have presented reports which have paved the way to a settlement when the prospects of compromise being reached seemed remote. In this case, however, a rather special situation arises. Whereas Courts of Inquiry have normally consisted of three members, an independent chairman, and a trade unionist and industrialist not directly concerned in the dispute, this one has a fourth member. He is a member of the National Board for Prices and Incomes, and it is presumably his duty to ensure that due weight is given to the Government's incomes policy by the Court.

One of the interesting questions raised by this dispute therefore is that of the incomes policy and what action the Government should take when a dispute of this kind arises. Can it remain neutral when conceding the union's claim might be regarded as breaching the incomes policy? And if it becomes necessary to set up a Court of Inquiry, can this be genuinely impartial if a member of the Prices and Incomes Board is added to it? But a good many other questions are also raised by this strike. Are artificial

difficulties created by adhering to industry wide bargaining? What are the rights of strikers? Are they entitled to strike, even in a just cause, if there is a danger of serious damage being done to the national economy? Are they entitled to do so before getting the results of a possible independent inquiry? And what are the limits of legitimate sympathetic action?

Many of the facts are still obscure at the time of writing. The Seamen's Union is being accused of threatening to extend the strike by getting the support of foreign unions who would refuse to sail their vessels to British ports. The charge has been denied by union leaders, but for the present purpose it is unimportant whether the threat has been made or not. It is still possible to ask whether or not action of this kind is morally justifiable. Having established certain moral principles, we can make judgments of whatever action has been taken.

The Right to Strike

The trade union movement appears to regard the right to strike as one of their essential freedoms. It would, however, be quite wrong to think of the right to strike in terms of the right of a man to leave his job. In normal circumstances, I would regard the right of the individual worker to leave his job as absolute. There must be minor qualifications to this. One could hardly recognise the right of the individual surgeon to "down tools" in the middle of an operation, thereby endangering the life of the patient; nor indeed could one imagine any surgeon acting in this manner. The British Courts will not order a man back to his job, even though he has walked out in breach of his contract of employment. He may be held liable to pay damages for breach of contract, but the Courts will not compel him to carry out his contract if he does not want to.

The freedom of one man to give up a job, and to look for another—perhaps in a different field, perhaps in another part of the country, perhaps abroad—is one thing. The right of a collective body of men to withdraw their labour as a body but insisting that their jobs should be kept

open for them to return to when they have secured what they consider to be acceptable terms is another matter altogether. The right to strike exists, but it is subject to far more qualification than the right of the individual worker to give up a job and look for another.

The first requirement for a strike to be justified is that it is undertaken in a just cause. This, of course, is often a most difficult matter to decide. There will be some levels of wages where everybody would be unanimous in saying they were unjustly low. At the other end of the scale, there are claims that all right-thinking people would condemn as excessive. But there will be a range in between where many will maintain that justice is still being denied the worker whilst others maintain that wages have gone too high. Since such disagreement is always likely to occur, it would suggest the desirability of some kind of arbitration wherever possible. If well-informed and well-intentioned people with no axe to grind can differ over what is just, how much more difficult is it to get agreement between those who are directly interested in the outcome of collective bargaining.

Other requirements besides a Just Cause

It is not enough that a strike should be in a just cause. It is also necessary, if it is to be justified, that there should be a due proportion between the good it is hoped to achieve and any harmful effects, especially to innocent parties. In the case of the seamen's strike, there is the danger that serious harm could be done to the national economy, and that, apart from long-term damage, serious hardship and inconvenience could be caused to many individuals. In view of the serious consequences of this particular strike, it is clearly impossible to justify it unless the settlement offered the seaman was *seriously* unjust. I am content to state that as a principle, and, not having the necessary detailed information, make no comment upon whether the offer made was reasonable or unreasonable.

Whilst workers are clearly justified in striking in order to secure for themselves reasonable wages and conditions of employment, they are not justified in using the strike

weapon without first trying to find a solution by other means. This obligation is all the heavier where the consequences of the strike are serious, as in this particular case. It would seem, therefore, that the seamen were wrong to reject the idea of an independent inquiry proposed by the government.

There is, with such an inquiry, always the possibility that its findings will not be acceptable to one or other of the parties. On the whole, I am inclined to the view that where a stoppage can do really serious harm to the economy as a whole, both parties should be prepared to abide by the findings of impartial investigators. Once the findings of an impartial inquiry are rejected, there must be at least a very strong presumption that the cause is not just.

Sympathetic Action

One of the questions that arises in a good many strikes is whether other workers should give their support. Support may, of course, take many different forms. Where workers are on strike in a just cause, there can, for example, be no doubt about the legitimacy of other unions giving financial aid to the strikers, either by outright gift or by loans. The difficult issue is where the strike is unjust or where more direct support is being contemplated.

First, I would maintain that there can be no excuse for a union automatically assuming that any strike by another union is just. Trade unions are human institutions and are just as fallible as any other human organisation. If one group of workers has to use the strike weapon to secure justice for themselves, they may be entitled to expect other organised groups of workers to help them; but they have no right to expect blind support. Other groups should support the strikers only after a careful and responsible examination of the facts of the case.

The more difficult question is what kind of support is permissible. Here, I think, the most important principle to bear in mind is that the workers' quarrel is with their employers and nobody else. They have no right whatever to try and blackmail their employers by deliberately making life as difficult as possible for the innocent public. They

are entitled to withdraw their labour and nothing more. They have no right to try and prevent the general public from finding ways around the difficulties created by the strike. Deliberately to cause harm to innocent third parties is immoral. Under no circumstances can the end justify the means.

There seems little doubt that the seamen have some legitimate complaints against the shipowners. Whether there is sufficient to justify strike action, especially in view of the offer of an inquiry, is another matter. Even if they have cause for a strike, they are only entitled to act against the shipowners. Let us look, then, at some of the possible directions in which support might be sought from foreign unions. One is that British ships abroad might be "blackened". This would mean they would not be handled in foreign ports by dock workers, and so on, and they would be held up until the strike was settled. This could conceivably be justified, especially in certain special circumstances. It has been suggested, for example, that the oil companies have diverted their British registered tankers to foreign ports in order to prevent the crews paying off on return to the United Kingdom and joining the strike. Meanwhile, supplies to British refineries can be maintained by other vessels belonging to foreign-registered vessels of the big oil companies.

Naval Intervention

It has been suggested that if the Royal Navy were called in to move vessels in order to keep the ports open to foreign ships arriving, all ships, other than food ships, coming to Britain would be blacked. Such action could not in any circumstances be morally justified. To stop foreign vessels bringing supplies of any kind to this country or to stop them from taking out British exports would in no way add to the difficulties of the British shipowners, and so make no direct contribution to achieving the seamen's end. Such action could only be intended as deliberately attempting to blackmail the shipowners into making a settlement by threatening to cause the maximum harm and inconvenience to the nation. It may well be that

the union does not intend to take action of this kind—let us hope that it is avoided. Nevertheless, we should make no mistake. The Government is fully entitled to use the Royal Navy or any other means to keep the ports open. There were protests when it was thought that naval vessels were taking more than essential foodstuffs to some of the Scottish isles. This was denied, but why were the protests made? Because too many trade unionists think that when a strike is on nothing should be done to ease the inconvenience caused to the general public unless it becomes a matter of life and death. It is time that these people learned that the public has rights as well as them; and if they are not prepared to recognise other people's rights the time will come when something has to be done to prevent them abusing theirs.

The Court of Inquiry

The Government has now set up a Court of Inquiry. The reader will, of course, have the advantage of knowing what the Court says by the time he sees this article. Nevertheless, it is worth asking at this stage whether the Court can be truly impartial with a member of the Prices and Incomes Board attached to it. Or is this really a serious question? The principle of an incomes policy has been accepted by the two sides of industry, though individual unions and employers may not yet accept the idea, as many uncommitted individuals. Nevertheless, we cannot get away from the fact that the general level of wages and other money incomes is a matter of grave concern for the public good, and it is farcical to think of a Court of Inquiry trying to carry out its function without giving any consideration to an incomes policy.

A false mystique has grown up in this country about the independence of arbitrators and members of Courts of Inquiry. It is essential that the men and women exercising these roles should be independent, in the sense that they do not favour one side or the other. There is no reason to suppose that anything has happened in recent years to undermine this impartiality of arbitrators. The Prices and Incomes Board is itself impartial, as was its predecessor,

the much maligned National Incomes Commission. Arbitrators should be impartial in the way our judges are — administering the law, *as they find it*, without fear or favour.

No Guidance

In fact, arbitrators and those exercising similar functions on Wages Councils and Courts of Inquiry have never been in this position. There has been one fundamental difference. They have never been given any guidance. They have had to exercise not only the impartial role of the judge but also that of the legislator. Today, we are moving towards the acceptance of an incomes policy. To suggest that arbitrators and others should work within the framework of that policy does not undermine their impartiality. The judge at a murder trial is none the less impartial because it has been laid down by Parliament and the Common Law that murder is a crime. We do not expect that our independent judges should be so independent that they can decide for themselves what is and what is not a crime. In the same way, if we have an agreed national policy for wages, a Prices and Incomes Board, arbitrators and the rest may be completely independent in making judgments *about particular cases in relation to a particular policy*. The incomes policy lays down a norm of 3-3½ per cent for wage increases. Now whatever some people pretend to think, real wages cannot rise steadily by more than this amount if this is the rate at which national productivity is increasing. Admittedly, there are groups who are relatively poorly paid and who ought to get bigger increases than this norm, *but the corollary is that some relatively well-paid groups must accept less*. Naturally every body would like to get more than the norm, and it is easy for any individual or any particular group to see their own as a special case. True independence of arbitrators or members of the Prices and Incomes Board does not lie in freedom to ignore the government policy, *but in impartiality in deciding whose is really a special case*.

In this particular instance, what are the advantages or disadvantages of a Court of Inquiry with a fourth member from the Prices and Incomes Board over a reference to

the Board itself? The answer to this, I think, is that the role of the Board is a more limited one than that of an arbitrator or Court of Inquiry. Its function is to decide whether or not an increase in wages already made or being proposed is compatible with the national incomes policy. There could be circumstances where an increase in pay would not be incompatible with the incomes policy but might be disastrous for the industry concerned. With the seamen the Prices and Incomes Board might well decide that they had a special case. Conceding this would not establish a precedent that was harmful to the working of the policy and therefore to the economy as a whole. At the same time, it might well be that the forces of international competition in shipping make it impossible for the employers to make the concessions demanded of them without, in the long run, a serious running down of their fleets. Thus it is quite conceivable that if the Court of Inquiry does not fully accept the seamen's case, it will not be the fourth member from the Prices and Incomes Board who is primarily responsible for this.

Hours Worked

Apart from the question of wages, the Court of Inquiry may go into broader issues. There is, for example, the question of the way in which shipowners interpreted the previous agreement which accepted the 56-hour week at sea. A watch-keeper at sea normally works 56 hours a week (for hours on watch and eight hours off, all through the week). For this, a man was, under the previous agreement, to receive his normal month's pay without overtime. Nevertheless, it does not appear to have been the union's intention in accepting this agreement to allow all seamen to be called upon to work 56 hours a week, even where this had not been usual and they were not watchkeepers. The Court of Inquiry is, therefore, more appropriate than a straightforward reference to the Prices and Incomes Board. A Court could have been asked to bear the incomes policy in mind, but it is easier for this to be done if a fourth member from the Board is added, because he will be familiar with the precedents already established and be

able to maintain consistency of judgment with that of the Board.

The Unit of Bargaining

It has been suggested in some quarters that many of the cargo companies could well afford to agree to the men's demands but that it would be much more difficult for companies with a bigger interest in passenger traffic. The latter are, of course, experiencing not only competition from foreign shipping lines but also very serious competition from the increasing use of air travel. Can they increase efficiency and so cut costs? What happens if they raise fares?

In the latter event, the trade might well decline. We could envisage a further loss to the airlines, and passenger vessels limiting themselves more and more to cruises rather than taking large numbers of people across the Atlantic on regular schedules. This would not be an undesirable development. It would mean that some seamen would lose their jobs, but other jobs would be available to them in a world of full employment. (Engine room staff would, of course, have better prospects than seamen.) Meanwhile, the prospering cargo trade would remain an attractive career for youngsters leaving school. If, on the other hand, it were forced to limit its wages to what the less prosperous passenger trades could afford, a serious recruitment problem might well arise. Some union statements suggest that recruitment is already becoming difficult in an era of high pay and full employment on shore.

What is Justice?

"What is Justice? It is the permanent and unshakable will to give to each his due right."—Institutes of Justinian.

What is meant by "rethinking infallibility"? Is the Church likely to have married deacons? Will the Church abandon the whole concept of the natural law? Why don't Catholic trade unionists think more of service to the community and less of self-interest?

Any Questions?

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

What is meant by "rethinking infallibility"?

THE meaning depends on the user of the phrase, which can mean anything from a contempt for papal pronouncements to a warning against thinking that Catholics have all the answers.

Centuries ago, someone said: *Roma locuta est, causa est finita*—Rome has spoken, and that's the end of the matter. It is comforting, at times, to have matters settled; and the desire for such comfort may have encouraged Catholic minds to be lazy. Instead of tackling problems and trying to understand and solve them, they have been tempted to turn to the back of the book where the answers to all the problems are to be found.

To have the correct answer before setting out to discover it from the data is a wonderful advantage if knowledge by faith is used to illuminate the road to truth that reason must take: but if Catholics, knowing the answer, yield to temptation and stop thinking, they misuse a great blessing. Is it true, I wonder, that the majority of practising Catholics know little more than the articles of their faith? When they have stated a doctrine, they can answer one question about it or one objection to it, but they are stumped if their answer is queried. Convinced Protestants may not have such a firm hold on the articles of their creed, but they can make out a good case for them because they had to think their way to their convictions. The proverb, "It

is better to travel hopefully than to arrive", can be condemned as the usual proverbial nonsense, because truth is an essential of human happiness; but it does draw attention to the odd condition of Catholics who have arrived without travelling. Infallibility has done all their work for them, and they invoke it as they would an oracle or the genie of the lamp.

At the other extreme are Catholics who blush for the Pope's infallibility, and are ashamed of knowing for certain. They want to join the travellers and share their hopefulness. The right position is between those two extremes. From the infallibility of the Church and the Pope we have a guarantee that what we think we know we really do know: it is truth. But we can never know everything about that truth. We can rest in it, but we must still travel to find it.

Is the Church likely to have married deacons?

THERE is talk about having them, and that is a good sign; but the question needs much more airing before we can talk of likelihood. The faithful must be introduced to the idea before there can be a public opinion about it. The authorities in the Church would not defeat their purpose, if it is to have married deacons, by imposing them on startled and prejudiced institutions and parishes. Decisions would have to be taken about the functions of married deacons, and they would want training, provision for their livelihood and family life, and acquaintance at all levels with the other clergy.

How could they serve the Church? There is a shortage of priests throughout the world. Would it not be a blessing all round if there were deacons for the administration of Holy Communion in missionary countries where lack of priests deprives the faithful of that sacrament? They could administer other sacraments too. At need, priests can now confirm so there would be nothing new in a lower order of clergy giving sacraments normally reserved to a higher order. Deacons might also act as catechists and instructors of converts.

Parish organisation will have to be adapted to new ways of housing people. A huge block of flats is almost a parish in itself, and several such blocks together can be almost a foreign mission. A deacon living with his family in one of the flats would himself be, and would help other Catholics to be, a christianizing influence.

Many convert clergymen deeply regret the cessation of their active apostolate. They are educated and dedicated men, and it is a shame to lose their learning and their devotion. To admit them to the diaconate would be to tap a neglected source of talent and zeal, and to make another bond between clergy and laity.

Is it true that the Church is abandoning the whole concept of the natural law ?

SHE can't: to do so would be to abandon fact. I know there is great talk about revising the concept of natural law; but only those on the fringe of the discussion, hardly knowing the subject and hearing only snatches of argument, could interpret the debate as natural law being tried for its life. It is necessary because it is true; and it will survive attempts to kill it.

Is man of a certain kind ? He is. Then he has a nature, like every other being that is of a certain kind. Do we know what kind he is ? We know that he is a person, with a constitution partly spiritual, partly material; he depends on God and exists to do the will of God; his material element is in all probability linked with a universal process of material evolution. We do not know everything about him, but we know the essentials. That knowledge can be expressed as a law of his nature, stating his purpose and the ways in which his purpose can be accomplished. To abandon the law would be to abandon the truth that man is of a certain kind, or to assert that the essential truth about him is unknowable. There are philosophers who make just that assertion, but by so doing they fall into self-contradiction.

That the Church knows the essentials about man follows from her commission given by God to teach man how to

behave so as to fulfil his nature. She has authority to state what the natural law is, and how it is to be applied. She looks to specialists for further information about matter, spirit and personality in man; but she is herself the source of right and adequate teaching of the principles of human behaviour.

Why don't Catholics in the trade unions change self-interest into service of the community?

WHAT do you mean by "in the trade unions"? There are thousands of Catholic paid-up members of trade unions. They belong for the benefits that accrue to membership, but their participation in trade unions is limited to paying dues and enjoying advantages. It is only the rare Catholic who feels responsible for trade union principles and policy: the rest are as indolent as the vast majority. Most of them, probably, have never given a thought to the history of trade unions, their traditions, their place and function in modern society, and the suggestions for policy changes made by friends and opponents.

Trade unions originated in the need for solidarity among wage-earners in their fight for social justice. They must still watch over the interests of their members, but, now that there is a general desire for justice, fighting should give place to co-operation. Both labour and management have much to learn, and the perpetuation of the old belligerence impedes the learning process, and it postpones the day when both sides will see that there must be a national solidarity instead of the sectional solidarities following selfish interests.

If Catholic trade unionists would learn about trade unionism as part of the national economy, and would take a full and intelligent part in trade union government, they would greatly benefit themselves and the nation. They are in the favoured position of having two votes, one as citizens and another as the support of the T.U.C., the most powerful influence in government outside Parliament.

When men and women join trade unions, it is already too late to educate them. Every school should provide courses

on the social, economic and political structure of the country, and on the moral principles underlying membership of the State and of lesser associations.

I have just read a passage from St. Basil where he says that what I possess over the necessities of life belongs to the needy. If this is true, why isn't it preached instead of platitudes about charity?

ST. BASIL'S statement seems to me to be demonstrably true. Do you agree to the proposition that God, creating the universe and man in it, intended the material goods of the world to be available for all men according to their needs? It follows that every human being has a primary right to the necessities of life—the material goods without which he cannot live humanly. Those necessities go beyond a subsistence-amount of food, clothing and shelter to include the means of personal development. I myself have that primary right. If, when I have satisfied my right, I have possessions in excess, I may not use them for myself if there are human beings short of the necessities of life. I may keep that superfluity as my property, but it is not mine for use. The use of it belongs to those who need it for the enjoyment of the primary right.

In a sense, I am in debt to the poor for that excess of material goods: I owe it to them — not personally and directly, but indirectly as a member of society. I must use my influence in society to make a social conscience and to induce society to meet its obligation to the needy. The affluent countries make large contributions to countries in process of development; but the contributions are nothing like large enough, and they look mean and stingy in comparison with the penury of those countries and the luxury and extravagance of the rich. The doctrine should be propagated, but not in sermons—it deserves and requires a series of lectures and discussions.

The Padres of San Miguelito

X: THE PRIEST IN THE MODERN WORLD—1

M. CAMPBELL-JOHNSTON, S.J.

THIS tenth instalment in the San Miguelito series is devoted to the first part of a talk delivered by Father Mahon in January, 1965, at the *Priest in the Modern World Forum* of the University of Loyola in Chicago. Since the talk is a result of the experience and thinking of all the priests in the San Miguelito team, they decided to publish it as their 11th Report. It is intended to be not so much an account of their work, but rather an enquiry into what they have learned about themselves and their priesthood. Part of the talk dwells on projections of possible changes in structures and interpretation of doctrine. The Fathers themselves emphasise that these are no more than experiments in thinking aloud and should not be taken either as dogma or even as suggestions for change.

REPORT XI (Part 1) — March 15th, 1965

I should like to remind you, as I begin this talk, of something you all know — that I am not a theologian in the technical sense of the word, still less am I an historian. Someone has made the distinction between the theologian and the “fathers of the Church”. I might possibly qualify as a “father of the Church”—one who, because of his vision validated against people, can give to the Church a new insight which must subsequently be analyzed, researched, corrected or rejected by the trained theologians.

We live in a time of change, of reform or *aggiornamento* or, as we say in Latin America, in the age of revolution. It matters little whether there is actually more change or whether we are merely more conscious of movement, the fact is clear: we live in an era of change. Priests, desirous of being men of their times, want desperately to participate

in the change and revolution. So we see them today taking part in and even directing many of the modern movements such as civil rights, community organisation, trade unionism, co-operatives and, in Latin America, popular education, economic development, Christian Democratic parties, agrarian reform, etc. — while others work in the more traditional movements such as Catholic Charities and so on.

I find the unrest and disquiet among modern priests encouraging and the courage shown by priests participating in unpopular causes very edifying. But I frankly am of the opinion that the role of the priest has become more and more confused: at least, it does not accord with my own personal concept of priesthood. My task in this talk will be to enunciate and explain what I think our priesthood should really mean. I shall not offer precise theological proofs for my position because I have not sufficiently elaborated them. Still less shall I adduce historical proofs because I simply do not possess them. Rather I shall offer what might possibly be an insight into the priesthood, culled from a somewhat varied experience in this country and outside of it, and from a lot of thought and meditation. Whether or not my views have any true value, I leave to you and others to decide.

Teaching Doctrine and Preaching the Word

It has always been incumbent upon the members of the Church (here and throughout this talk I shall use Church in its widest meaning: the body of faithful who are the visible sign of Christ to the world) to participate in all those activities which elevate, educate, alleviate and civilize men: thus every Christian is committed to change in human society. But it seems to me that the ordained priest has a special function in the Christian body which we have long failed to define precisely. The priest as *priest* is committed to change, reform and revolution, *but* one engendered by *preaching of the Word of God*.

In order to avoid an ever-present danger of confusion in this area, let us briefly make a few important distinctions: the first between teaching of Christian doctrine and the

preaching of the Word of God; the second between community organization and the making of Church. Teaching of Christian doctrine and morality is the informing of people of the basic truths of our Christian religion and should be done by brothers, sisters, laity and, at times, even by priests themselves. But such teaching is not the preaching of the Word of God, although we have often mistaken one for the other. Well then, what does it mean to preach the Word of God? I am tempted to use words like dynamic, social, creative — but these words are becoming rather platitudinous. Perhaps I can bring it to life with a few simple words that have echoed from Abraham to Christ to John XXIII: "And God said: 'Form me a people; form me a people; form me a nation that will be a light to the world, to all the rest of the human race'". It is the precise role of the priest, therefore, not to teach but to preach—that is to say, to stand on the hilltop and state: "God said to us: 'Be my people; so let us be his people—not mere individuals nor the masses, but so deeply and so awfully human as to be God's people—what he always wanted, the pinnacle of his own divine creation'". Like Christ, the priest is the human instrument of the calling forth of the Word of God and, like his Master, he is likewise the vehicle of its response. The priest should never speak in terms of "you" but rather as "we", for his role demands commitment *with* his people. The dialogue of the Word runs something like the following:

Priest: "And God said: 'Form me a people'."

People: "Amen, yes he did!"

Priest: "Well then, let us form a people."

People: "Yes, father, let's do it."

Priest: "But do we understand what it means to be a people, a people of God?"

People: "We can learn. Show us."

Gradually the response gets louder and deeper and more in unison.

People: "Let's act like a people of God. Let us worship together like his people."

Community and Church

It is clear then, I trust, that the teaching of Christian doctrine and morality, while related to the Word, is not really the same thing. But how does the preaching of the Word, the making of a people, differ from the work of a community organizer, say that of Saul Alinsky whom many hold to be the country's best organizer and who is surely the most controversial? By way of parenthesis, let me state here that I have known Saul Alinsky for more than 10 years and I very much admire him and his work. The word of Saul Alinsky (if I may use that phrase) is in some ways the same as the Word of God: namely the call to transform the masses into a people. But there are many profound differences. First, the word of Saul Alinsky is brilliant, but a pale light compared to the powerful creativity of the Word of God, particularly as uttered in the person of the great Jew, Jesus Christ. Secondly, the two differ in their dynamic: the community organization of Alinsky works on a vision unenlightened by revelation and thus must and does fall back on some of the painfully alienative processes present among us — self-interest and resentment: while the Word of God issues a call to love, self-sacrifice and renunciation. The Word can use such an exalted dynamic because, while Saul Alinsky believes in the human race, we believe in it (or, at least, we should) much more deeply because of the presence of the Lord among us as our brother, the great human being who bears within himself the seed of the reunification and redemption of mankind. Lastly, there is a profound difference between the two words because the Church is the seed, the light, the salt and the leaven in the world, and not the whole tree, nor the only light, not the meat to be preserved, nor the dough nor the mass to be lifted. Saul Alinsky works with *all* to form a better world while the priest works (precisely but not exclusively) with the Church, the family of believers which, by its commitment and union, serves as a light to Alinsky and to all other men of good will, making their work easier by showing them what it means to be truly human, to be truly a people.

The part of the Priest

I cannot think of a nobler *human* vocation nor a more exciting adventure than that of a priest because he sets out to form a great people, great human beings, and his weapon is precisely the Word of God. What philosopher, scientist, statesman, sociologist, theologian or community organizer has such a powerfully creative instrument?

Every sacrament is an encounter that calls for the taking of an oath. Holy Orders, I submit, is the taking of an oath to form the people of God; to reform the world—nothing less—and the priest swears to do it *by means of the Word of God*. It follows that to the degree that the priest commits himself to the preaching of the Word of God, to that same degree he is faithful to his priesthood; on the other hand, to the degree that the priest departs from the ministry of the Word, to that same degree he abdicates his priesthood. Finally, it is my position that the ministry of the Word of God to real people is the true function of the ordained priest: he it is who by calling, showing, leading, answering, struggling and working with flesh and blood, builds the Church, the people of God.

I am not an enemy of flexibility and, therefore, I do not wish to say that church authorities could not and should not assign priests to other tasks. If my superior were to ask me to work under Saul Alinsky, or to teach English, or to direct Catholic Charities, or to administer the insurance programme of the Archdiocese or to counsel disturbed people, I would gladly do as asked because, after all, besides being a priest, I am also a cleric bound to the service of the Church. I say I would do it willingly—with one important reservation: that no one try to tell me that any of these positions is truly priestly work. Important, valuable work, surely; but according to my conviction, not priestly work. Church authorities have an enormous, complicated task of administration; in the light of limited finances and trained personnel, it does seem reasonable to divert ordained priests, who are in abundant supply, into other non-Word tasks. I say we seem to have an abundance

of priests because how else could one explain the vast percentage of priests assigned to non-priestly tasks?

San Miguelito

If I seem to be so sure of myself in this matter, perhaps it is because I am fresh from an experience of the last two years that I would give anything to have you share, all of you: the experience, that is, of preaching the Word of God in almost virgin soil, full time, uninhibitedly, without regard to structures—and the experience has left me gasping for breath.

We surely do not have the time to go into the entire San Miguelito experience, but I shall try to sum it up in the following manner. The Word of God uttered, present and active in a community has palpable results, as does the spirit of the Word. St. Paul describes it well in the fifth chapter of his letter to the Galatians: "Now the words of the flesh are plain, which are immorality, impurity, licentiousness, idolatry, witchcraft, enmity, strife, jealousy, anger, selfishness, dissension, factions, envy, drunkenness, carousing and the like". One would have thought that Paul had San Miguelito in mind when he wrote those words because he describes the situation to a "t". Every one of those works of the flesh was present to a very disturbing degree. But in the midst of all this, after two years, there has appeared a relatively small but truly Christian community and the results are quite visible. As Paul puts it: "But the fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness and self-control". Whereas San Miguelito was once notorious for rivalries, immorality, carousing, witchcraft, severe sectional and class hatreds, murders and even suicides, bitterness, defeatism and cynicism, now there has come a change: men have learned to attend a party or a dance without getting roaring drunk, peace has come to many families and between various sectors of the area. Among this nuclear Christian community, bitterness has been replaced by a spirit of friendliness and, above all, of joy; the cynicism, hopelessness and despair by a spirit of hope and confidence. One has only to see them together at any affair, or better

still to hear them sing an Alleluia at Mass, to catch the spirit of joy and hope. All this was done, not with a parish school nor with parish organisation nor with a co-operative nor even with catechesis, but rather with the Word of God. What has taken place has been true conversion. To think of all the years I have used that word without understanding it well (of the years spent in a U.S. parish with an average annual rate of 300 adult converts!), of ignoring the prefix "con" in the word conversion. Conversion does not mean merely changing one's religion nor does it mean merely changing one's beliefs and personal habits. It really means leaving one's isolation and joining up with others to form the Church, the people of God.

The Word of God Today

Why then are we priests, even those in parishes, not truly ministers and prophets of the Word? The answer must be that we do not know the Word of God or that we do not trust it or both. Many of us would reply that we simply do not know the Word of God well because we were not taught it adequately in our schools, all the way from grammar school to the major seminary. Please do not interpret my remarks as an attack on my teachers or on my schooling. If I stand here before you today with something worthwhile to say, it is due in great part to the teachers who trained me and the system that formed me. But to say that my formation was inadequate is nothing but hard, perennial truth. On the other hand, I would be terribly disloyal to my teachers were I to stand and say that our understanding of the Word does not always have to be deepened, widened, and indeed, changed and evolved.

Secondly, we do not trust the Word of God. Oh yes, we say we do but often we do not. We erect schools, we get active in civil rights, we do charity work—many times, whether consciously or unconsciously, to soften up people for the Word. A more subtle distrust of the Word is summed up in the expression: "One has to humanise people before one can Christianise them". What a terrible insult to the Word himself who brought the Gospel, the good news, directly to the poor of his own day who, in

every sense, were poorer than the poor of our own age.

Why don't we trust the Word of God? I suppose because no one ever made it meaningful for us and we simply do not know how to make it relevant for others. In this age of renewed interest in the Word of God, we are perilously close to becoming Bible faddists. We show people how to start their Bible study with the kerygma of the Acts and how to follow the whole of Salvation History. All well and good, but such is not the preaching of the Word. If we want to take a good lesson in preaching, let us go back to John the Baptist or to Jesus. Did Christ ever give a course in the Bible? He surely did not! Did he cite whole passages of Scripture to his listeners? With one exception, he did not. In fact, he quoted texts so loosely that at times we are at a loss to find their source. I am not railing against Bible courses; I merely wish to point out that there is a prior necessity for our people: the preaching of the Word in a relevant fashion. Christ was the prophet par excellence who translated the Word for his people according to their customs, language and times. For example, his use of the word *kingdom*. I submit that he could not have chosen a more subversive or dangerous word. Subversive because the constant mention of that word brought the Roman and Jewish leaders to a frenzy of hostility. It was for preaching the kingdom that he was killed. Dangerous because he ran the risk of being misunderstood. And so he was, by his own followers. But he used it anyway, deliberately courting danger and misunderstanding. Why? Because it was a call to greatness, grandeur and glory. How else to translate the Word of God?

Our problem is that the word kingdom is no longer stimulating nor provocative. Nobody in Panama, for instance, wants to hear the word kingdom. Yet we continue to use the word and it falls flat. We must be relevant to our people as Christ was to his. What word in Spanish most nearly approximates the word Kingdom of the Lord's time? There is no doubt in my mind that the word is *revolución*! Is it subversive? Of course! Using it, do we run the risk of being misunderstood? Surely! But what

other word can interest, inspire, stimulate, and provoke the Panamanian people?

A short time ago, a young civil engineer working as a Papal Volunteer in the mountains of Guatemala came to see us in Panama. He was worried and depressed by the lack of reaction from the Indians with whom he was working. He was there to organise co-operatives and self-help projects such as electrification and aquaducts. After six months the Indians were friendly but passive and immobile. We asked him what was the most significant word in their language. He replied that it was "*mandar*"—to command. They were a very obedient people; in fact, the highest value in their culture was that of obedience. For this reason the Indian had but one wife and was faithful to her because God had clearly stated that a man was to have but one wife. We suggested that he take out the Book of Genesis and read to them the passage where God tells man (Adam) to take dominion over the earth. If he did nothing more than insist on this point for a year, he would be truly preaching the Word of God. It might well be that the Word would move that tribe from a static into a progressively human culture. "As long as you have to go to the water and not the water to you, as long as you must obey the night and not the night obey you (they had refused to install electric power and running water), then you are clearly disobeying the command of God to dominate nature, to be a great people."

Returning to Chicago and to the United States, where is the prophetic preaching of the Word? Who is your prophet—Saul Alinsky, Father Curran, Landry? Or is he still Christ the Lord, but translated to your times and circumstances? I strongly suspect that the relevant *Word* still lies hidden within the now-evolving theology of City, that it will be a Word so stimulating and provocative that it will inspire, convert and unite many within and without our present Church structure and, at the same time, terrify, scandalize and alienate a goodly number both within and without the Catholic Church.

(To be continued)

Book Reviews

RED LIGHT FROM CUBA

Castroism by Theodore Draper; Pall Mall Press, 35s.

Trouble in Guyana by Peter Simms; George Allen & Unwin, 30s.

THERE is a very real sense in which Castroism can be described as Marxism in reverse. To see why one has only to consider its early beginnings; Castro and his tiny guerilla band tucked away in a remote corner of the wild Sierra Maestra. Why were they there? It is doubtful whether they really knew themselves. They were without an ideology; essentially, as Castro later confirmed, they were men feeling their way; at the time, Communism contributed little to their thinking. Until almost the moment itself of victory, when they swept triumphant into Havana, they were little more than an isolated group. There was next to no identity of outlook between them and the peasantry, for the simple reason that there were practically no peasants in the wild, rugged terrain of the Sierra Maestra that was their first home. Castro and his group were not projected into action as an expression of peasant discontent. Had this been the case their movement would have fitted the Marxist categories like a glove; the forces making for revolt would have been present in the peasant mass of which they would have been no more than the projection. But this was not the case. Castro and his guerilla band were not activated by peasant discontent. They had to create it in order to win followers to themselves. In this sense, they stood Marx on his head.

Yet the Cuban Revolution was Communist. It became so after its moment of triumph, when the defection of the middle class from Batista and the fading away of his army allowed Castro and his companions to take Havana. For some months after that it was anybody's guess how things would go. In the end, they went to the Communists. The dividing line may be set in October, 1959, when Major Hubert Matos, Castro's old comrade of guerilla days, was

arrested for protesting against the Red infiltration of the rebel army that Castro had built round himself before and after his victory. In November of the same year, there were shake-ups favouring the Communists in both Cabinet and National Bank. Next, came the first stage of what turned out to be a communist take-over of the Cuban Confederation of Labour. In December, after the equivalent of a people's trial, Major Matos was sentenced savagely to twenty years' imprisonment. In February, 1960, Anastas Mikoyan, First Deputy Premier of the Soviet Union, arrived to sign the first Soviet-Cuban trade pact in Havana. There followed the expropriation of the American oil companies, the severing of economic ties with the United States and the attempted accelerated industrialisation of Cuba's economy on a basis of Soviet and satellite aid. By the end of 1960, it could be said with truth that Communism in Cuban form had come to the Caribbean. Guerilla feuding on a tiny scale had culminated in Marxist revolution. This is Castro's contribution to communist theory. The point to notice is that he never intended it, for he was without an ideology originally. He came to it by hindsight, after he had achieved power. As Draper says so well in his excellent book, "Castroism is a leader in search of a movement, a movement in search of power, and power in search of an ideology. From its origins to today, it has had the same leader and the same road to power, but it has changed its ideology (to its present communist form)". What Castroism offers is a new way to the attainment of communist power. This still leaves Marx on his head; but, in today's confused world of many communist roads, it still allows the Cubans to be welcomed into the Party's fold.

Communism, as Castro saw it after his victory, was valuable because it offered an apparatus for the consolidation of revolutionary power. For Castro, it was not an early ideology, but a means, after military victory, of establishing with rapidity social revolution. Ideological attraction came later, after the establishment of the Marxist apparatus as an instrument of social reform. "In effect", writes Draper, "Castroism gave Communism total.

power in Cuba, and Communism gave Castroism an ideology of total power". That is neat, and true. Castro, you might say, is essentially a pragmatic Communist. Meanwhile, of course, ideological Communists elsewhere—particularly in South America—have not lost sight of the lesson of Castro's revolution, that a few dedicated guerillas can create the conditions, which make possible eventually the communist take-over of a country. As Che Guevara — at once the interpreter of Castro's revolution and his evil genius—has put it in his pamphlet on guerilla warfare:

"We consider that these are the three fundamental contributions which the Cuban revolution has made to the mechanics of the revolutionary movements in America: (1) . . . Popular forces can win a war against the army. (2) . . . It is not always necessary to wait for all the conditions for a revolution to exist; the insurrectional focal point can create them, (3) . . . In underdeveloped America, the countryside must be fundamentally the locale of the armed struggle."

The remainder of Guevara's pamphlet is no more than an elaboration of these points. His aim in writing it was both to justify Castro's revolution in Marxist terms and show, at the same time, that it represented an original contribution to communist revolutionary theory.

Castro's approach to Communism, we have seen above, was pragmatic. His revolution took the Marxist road because it hoped, by so doing, to achieve rapid revolutionary results in the social and economic sectors of the country's life. Communism allowed Castro to break with Cuba's past and, at the same time, furnished him with an apparatus for engaging in the accelerated industrialisation of his country without incurring thereby the odium of having done so under the auspices of western capitalism. There is a parallel here with Maoist China, but it would be wrong to push it too far.

In fact, Castro's attempt at accelerated industrialisation, which owed so much to the dynamism of Che Guevara, ended in disaster. The wheel in Cuba has now come more than full circle. When the Castroites took over the country's

economy, they cut back on agricultural production in general and that of sugar in particular. Industrialisation was the order of the day. They discovered too late that raw materials for their factories had to be paid for before manufacturing could begin: they learnt with sadness that this process was as expensive—sometimes more so—than buying finished products direct from abroad. In the end, they had to step up agriculture to find the means of paying for raw materials. Rather late in the day they learnt that far from manufacture proving straightaway a substitute for agriculture, it was, in fact, its essential foundation. But, by that time, Cuban agriculture had slipped a long way behind the output of previous years. Castro had, in a sense, to begin all over again. His method has been to retreat from diversified production and concentrate more and more on a single crop. The acreage under sugar is greater now in Cuba than it was before Castro took over. But there are significant differences—its price in the world market has fallen heavily and its production is inefficiently done. “Volunteer” labour at harvest time has not worked well: army conscripts, now employed in increasing numbers, will not do much better. Castro, like George Brown, has yet to discover that government by exhortation brings certain failure. As a result of Castro’s naive disregard of the factors that keep turning the wheels of a country’s economic life, costs of sugar production in Cuba are rising just at a time when sugar prices on the world market are far less than they were several years ago. It can be said, I think, without any doubt, that Cuba’s attempt at rapid industrialisation under communist auspices has not met with any success.

This has not prevented Castro’s revolution from making its mark, more, I imagine, on the South American mainland than in Cuba itself. In a good many cases, old-time Communists have been shaken out of their determination to wait before moving until the forces making for revolution had been generated as Marx, in fact, said they would. Doing this, they had been in a state of stagnation for years. Now, since Castro showed the way, they have been shaken

with the realisation that a few determined guerillas may be able to produce, by their active postures of defiance, the social tensions which will issue in mass conflict. This is the grim possibility that gives Castro's revolution a claim to special consideration as a factor of strategic importance at the level of contemporary Communism's world-wide revolutionary planning. For Castro, a revolutionary situation favourable to Communism exists now in most of South America. What is lacking is the revolutionary will to exploit it, to launch the masses into battle. For this, in his theory, you need no more than a handful of determined guerillas, a mere dozen or so of dedicated men to kindle the flame. Given these few, the possibilities are boundless. Without them, the people's revolution will never get off the ground. This is Castro's contribution to contemporary communist strategy; and he has proved his point in practice. He speaks on the basis of what he has done. He is looking now at South America, which he considers ripe for revolution. It may well be that Castro's revolution in Cuba has brought nearer the day of that Continent's upheaval.

One small country in South America, no larger than England and Wales, has certainly been no stranger to acute social unrest. From 1953 until the winter of 1964, Guyana, so recently independent, was rarely free from trouble. Interesting sidelights on the reasons why are given by Peter Simms in a book published earlier this year. I found it useful in its analysis of the earlier historical factors which contributed their quota to the load of trouble which came to the one-time British colony during the years that followed the Jagan's assumption of political power in 1953. I found the book not so good in its analysis of the trouble itself. The reason, I would suggest, is that the author pays too little attention to Communism as a force in the thinking and active policy-making of Cheddi and Janet Jagan during those ten dark and difficult years, which tore the people of Guyana apart as they had rarely been torn before. I do not think that Mr. Simms, during his time in Guyana, ever fully understood the extent of the

fear which gripped those of its people who were opposed to Jagan because they saw him for what he was, a dedicated Marxist determined to turn their tiny country into the first Soviet satellite on the South American continent. The helplessness good men felt during much of that time brought many of them close to despair. In retrospect, it can be said that they were saved more, perhaps, by Dr. Jagan's intemperate stupidity than by any action on their part. Had he and his wife used their wits, Guyana might now be independent, but its people prisoners of a Red regime. That they are independent now, with as good a chance as any of making their way in freedom, is due to a clutch of factors, which cannot be gone into here, but amongst which Jagan's foolishness must be rated high. He never knew when to hold his hand, to let things ride his way. In the end, he threw his chances away, this time, I would say, forever. Had Castro's equivalent been in Guyana at the time and not Mintoff's—for that is largely what Jagan was—the story might have been very, very different.

Paul Crane, S.J.

'The Measure of All things'

"Once man is declared 'the measure of all things' there is no longer a True, or a Good, or a Just, but only opinions of equal validity whose clash can be settled only by political or military force; and each force in turn enthrones in its hour of triumph a True, a Good and a Just which will endure just as long as itself."—Bertrand De Jouvenel (*Power*).


~~~~~  
**N. P. MANDER LTD.**

(Incorporating Henry Speechly & Sons, Established 1860)

**Pipe Organs large and small**

RECENT INSTALLATIONS:

Campion Hall, Oxford

Salesian House, Beckford, Glos.

St. John's Cathedral, Portsmouth

Horseferry Road, S.W.1.

Convent at Roehampton

Cobham

Beaufort St., Chelsea

Assumption, Warwick St., W.1.

St. Aidan, East Acton.

A non-federated firm with over forty of the finest staff in the country  
at your disposal.

**ST. PETER'S ORGAN WORKS, LONDON, E.2.**  
~~~~~

This Subscription Business

This business of stepping up circulation is one an Editor constantly has to face. There are several ways of doing it. Editors with plenty of money behind them—and they exist—can use the ordinary advertisement media. If you saturate the public to a sufficient extent, you break through in the end and the subscriptions come in. But it takes an awful lot of money to do it.

If you are without an awful lot of money, as I am, you have to turn to other means, of which the chief is reliance on your readers. This is particularly the case with readers of *Christian Order*, who seem, somehow, so close to its Editor and give him such constant support.

Readers of *Christian Order* are asked very earnestly to assist the drive we are beginning now to raise the circulation of the magazine by doing two things: in the first place, renewing their own subscriptions as they fall due; secondly, by asking a friend for a subscription and sending it on, with his name and address, to the Rev. Paul Crane, S.J., 65 Belgrave Road, London, S.W.1., England.

Thank you.

ANTHONY BULLEN **GROWING IN CHRIST**

An Approach to Catechetics for Juniors

This book consists of ten discussion papers, to be used by a group of teachers together, which provide an approach to the new catechetics with this age group. Lists or supplementary reading, advice concerning the audio and visual aids which are available, and an outline syllabus covering the four year junior school course add enormously to the usefulness of the discussions.

By the author of **FIRST STEPS TO THE FATHER** (3/6) an approach to Modern Catechetics for Infants. 7/6

VAN CASTER **GOD'S WORD TODAY**

The author explains the fundamental principles of Bible, liturgy and doctrine and how these can serve the catechist, and goes on to show how to present God to the child by these means. Finally he shows how human reality, the life of the child and of the teacher, must be the starting point of the lesson, and how religion stems from this. 12/6

SISTER MARGARET OF JESUS **HERALDING CHRIST**

Teachers and priests have the great task of forming and informing integrated and believing Christians. For this they need to have felt the force of the Word, and know about the advances made in presentation and content in religion teaching, and how to organise classes within the parish. Complete with discussion questions and reading lists. 18/-

Don't forget the world-acclaimed best seller:

THE DOCUMENTS OF VATICAN II **Texts and Commentaries**

Paper 10/6; Cloth 45/-.



Geoffrey Chapman

London — Dublin — Melbourne